HARMONIC 360

A Multidimensional Diagnostic Framework for Personalized Jazz Improvisation, Adaptive Curriculum, and AI-Assisted Creative Learning

David Carlos Valdez
Independent Researcher and Jazz Educator
113 Vũ Miên, Tây Hồ, Hanoi, Vietnam
Email: Vietjazz360@icloud.com
Scientific Conference Manuscript | October 2026

Abstract

Harmonic 360 (H360) is an exploratory educational research framework integrating individualized musical assessment, six heterogeneous sources of student information, harmonic geometry, and artificial intelligence-assisted curriculum design. The six sources are astrology, Human Design, personality typology, Enneagram, acoustic and musical assessment, and observed creative behavior. Their contributions are deliberately differentiated: symbolic classifications generate hypotheses, whereas performance evidence and longitudinal observations provide grounds for evaluating educational interventions. The framework uses a 360-degree circular representation for pitch and proportional relationships, proposes MIDI360 as an interoperability layer, and defines functional musical operators independently of lyrics and stylistic production instructions. It investigates whether teacher-supervised adaptive instruction can improve engagement, harmonic comprehension, improvisational fluency, and creative autonomy. The paper sets out the conceptual architecture, a worked hypothetical instructional example, a feasible empirical evaluation, and safeguards against treating unvalidated symbolic systems as established psychological diagnostics. No outcome claims are made in the absence of controlled educational data.

Keywords: jazz improvisation; adaptive pedagogy; formative assessment; computational creativity; Human Design; harmonic geometry; MIDI360; generative AI.

1. Introduction

Jazz improvisation integrates auditory anticipation, harmonic recognition, rhythmic organization, motor execution, memory, social interaction, and spontaneous aesthetic judgment. Students do not acquire these abilities at uniform rates. A learner may know chord-scale theory yet fail to construct coherent phrases in real time; another may hear complex melodic motion accurately but lack the notation or terminology to explain it. Standardized sequences of repertoire, transcription, scales, and technical drills remain useful, but a uniform instructional order cannot fully accommodate these differences.

Drawing on more than forty years of jazz performance and teaching, the author proposes that an effective curriculum should begin with the particular student rather than a predetermined hierarchy of exercises. The pedagogical problem is not merely which materials to teach, but which entry point, presentation, tempo, level of constraint, and feedback process will make a musical concept accessible. H360 seeks to make these decisions explicit, testable, and revisable. Its educational purpose is not to classify people permanently; it is to generate and evaluate interventions that expand their creative possibilities.

The primary research question is whether a multidimensional, teacher-supervised diagnostic process yields better musical outcomes than conventional baseline assessment and instruction alone. Secondary questions concern the added value, if any, of exploratory symbolic datasets; the ability of structured operators to generate educationally equivalent material across styles; and the feasibility of a circular, microtonally capable representation for multimodal learning.

2. Pedagogical foundations

2.1 Improvisation, ear training, and melodic targeting

In practical instruction, the first diagnostic distinction is between recognition and production. A student may identify a target note when it is played, yet be unable to locate it reliably while improvising; another may execute a fingering pattern without hearing its relationship to the harmony. These are different problems and should not receive the same assignment. A useful sequence begins with sustained reference tones, singing a destination, locating it on the instrument, and then approaching it from several melodic directions. The teacher can change only one variable at a time: tempo, register, harmonic rhythm, interval size, or phrase length. This allows progress to be attributed to a particular adjustment rather than to an undefined increase in practice time.

The author generally favors ear-centered work over compulsory transcription assignments. Transcription can be valuable, but its usefulness depends on the student's objective and readiness. A student with a highly developed ear may benefit more from guided melodic invention, while another may gain from close study of recorded phrasing. H360 therefore treats teaching methods as selectable interventions rather than universal requirements.

The author's teaching draws on the linear improvisation traditions associated with Lennie Tristano, Lee Konitz, and Warne Marsh; on melodic and harmonic targeting associated with Bob Mover and Charles McPherson; and on the broader improvisational approaches encountered through George Garzone. These are practitioner lineages rather than controlled evidence of efficacy. Their common educational relevance lies in cultivating listening, continuity, harmonic direction, rhythmic flexibility, and personal vocabulary rather than merely reproducing prefabricated patterns.

H360 gives particular importance to auditory-first exercises. A student can sing a target tone, recognize its harmonic function against a drone, improvise a short approach phrase, and only afterward attach a theoretical label. The order can be reversed for learners who demonstrably benefit from conceptual preparation. Transcription is one possible tool, not a compulsory assignment or universal prerequisite. The teacher tests which sequence creates transferable musical understanding.

2.2 Kenny Werner and Effortless Mastery

Werner's contribution is especially important because it challenges the assumption that more technical information automatically produces better improvisation. In a teaching situation, one can compare a student's performance during an evaluative exercise with the same student's performance in a low-pressure exchange. If the student becomes freer when judgment is removed, a teacher has reason to investigate attentional and emotional interference. This does not establish a clinical diagnosis, but it changes the instructional question from "What material is missing?" to "Under what conditions can existing ability become available?"

An operational version of this insight is to alternate preparation and performance modes. During preparation, the student may stop, correct intonation, identify harmonic functions, and rehearse a target. During performance mode, the student plays through an entire phrase without interruption, prioritizing continuity, listening, and musical response. Afterward, the teacher and student identify a single actionable observation. Repeated trials can compare note continuity, phrase length, recovery after errors, and self-reported effort. This gives a practitioner insight a measurable educational form without claiming that the underlying philosophy is experimentally proven by the present paper.

H360 adds an individualized selection mechanism to this distinction. For some students, freedom emerges through call-and-response; for others, through composition, guided observation, duet playing, or a visual representation of harmonic movement. The central proposition is that creative ease and technical rigor are not opposites. They can be sequenced deliberately and assessed separately.

Kenny Werner's Effortless Mastery (1996) offers a pertinent practitioner account of the relationship between disciplined preparation, fear, attention, and creative freedom. Its educational importance here is the distinction between a skill that has not been acquired and a skill that becomes inaccessible under evaluative pressure. A student who cannot hear a harmonic destination requires a different intervention from a student who hears it in relaxed practice but loses access during performance. The first may need auditory training; the second may benefit from lower-stakes improvisation, graduated exposure, and attention to self-monitoring.

H360 does not treat Werner's account as experimental validation of symbolic personality frameworks. Rather, it uses the account to sharpen an instructional diagnostic question: is the obstacle perceptual, conceptual, technical, motivational, interpersonal, or performance-related? The educational response should follow the obstacle actually observed. This distinction can be assessed through repeated tasks under differing levels of performance demand.

2.3 Formative assessment and student agency

Formative assessment provides a more directly testable foundation: collect evidence of learning, interpret the gap between present performance and a defined goal, intervene, and reassess. H360 adopts this cycle while broadening the possible forms of evidence. Students remain collaborators in choosing creative goals and interpreting progress. They should be offered alternative routes through the curriculum rather than being restricted by a type designation. Teacher judgment, student consent, and measured learning outcomes take precedence over interpretive labels.

3. Six-dataset diagnostic architecture

H360 distinguishes six inputs. They are not six equally validated psychological tests. Four are exploratory interpretive systems, one is direct acoustic and musical assessment, and one is documented creative behavior. Their relationship is illustrated in Figure 1. The central research task is to determine whether any information beyond direct musical and observational evidence produces incremental instructional benefit.

3.1 Astrology

For the acoustic component, a celestial longitude can be treated as an angular coordinate independent of any personality interpretation. A difference between two longitudes defines an angular separation; that separation can then be transformed into a musical interval using an explicitly stated mapping. Such a transformation is mathematically reproducible even when the interpretation of the source positions remains speculative. The research must keep these claims separate: a coordinate-to-frequency transformation is testable as an engineering operation, whereas a claim that the resulting music captures a person's psychological identity requires separate evidence.

The educational use of this dataset is therefore exploratory. A generated pattern may function as an unfamiliar musical constraint, much as a composer might use a number series or geometric construction. Students can judge whether the material produces useful melodic challenges, increased engagement, or distinctive compositions. Its value should not be inferred merely from the symbolic origin of the data.

Astrology supplies computable angular coordinates and a symbolic vocabulary of planetary positions, aspects, houses, and degree imagery. In H360, selected coordinates may be mapped into an audible geometric structure; this is a defined artistic or mathematical translation, not evidence that planetary positions cause musical traits. Astrological interpretations can be used to pose tentative educational questions, but their predictive validity for musical learning has not been established. Their inclusion is therefore exploratory and must be assessed against chance, teacher expectations, and conventional student information.

3.2 Human Design

The most promising immediate application is not prediction but experimental lesson design. A teacher can construct two short lessons with the same harmonic objective: one emphasizes rapid response to musical cues, while the other emphasizes observation, selective entry, and the analysis of ensemble interaction. Students complete both lessons in counterbalanced order. Their accuracy, fluency, retention, and preference are then compared. Human Design categories can be included as exploratory grouping variables, but should not determine access to either method.

The same logic applies to decisions about practice pacing and collaboration. A student may appear more engaged in a duo than in a solo exercise, or may require additional listening time before responding. Those observations should be recorded directly. If they contradict a symbolic classification, the observed behavior takes priority. This rule prevents a classification from becoming a self-fulfilling explanation.

Human Design supplies categories including Type, Strategy, Authority, Centers, Gates, Channels, Definition, Profile, and Incarnation Cross. These categories can inspire contrasting instructional hypotheses about response, observation, initiation, collaboration, and decision-making. For example, a Generator-labeled student may be offered rapid call-and-response tasks, while a Projector-labeled student may be offered a listening-first intervention. Critically, both students must be able to try both approaches. The relevant result is which condition improves performance and engagement, not whether a label appears to fit.

3.3 Personality typology

Personality type, including the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, provides a vocabulary for reported preferences such as abstract versus concrete explanation or solitary versus collaborative work. Such categories can inform initial instructional questions, but categorical types should not be confused with stable, independently verified capacities. Self-reported preferences may change across settings and tasks. The study should record preference reports separately from measured educational responses.

3.4 Enneagram

The Enneagram is included as a distinct interpretive vocabulary emphasizing proposed motivational patterns. Questions about perfectionism, responses to criticism, uncertainty, risk-taking, and persistence may help teachers plan supportive conditions. However, these hypotheses require evaluation. No student should be told that a particular Enneagram type determines their creative ceiling, instrument suitability, or learning destiny.

3.5 Acoustic and musical assessment

A practical baseline protocol could include a short unaccompanied improvisation, an improvisation over a repeated harmonic progression, interval-matching tasks, rhythmic imitation, and a brief collaborative exchange. Audio should be recorded under consistent conditions, with tempo and harmonic materials documented. Evaluation should distinguish accuracy from originality: a phrase may contain a pitch error yet demonstrate sophisticated motivic development, or it may be technically correct while relying on a narrow stock vocabulary.

Possible quantitative measures include correct resolution to designated harmonic targets, timing deviation relative to a reference pulse, melodic range, repeated-motif transformation, and the number of sustained coherent phrases. These should be supplemented by blinded expert ratings of musical coherence, interaction, and expressive intent. Inter-rater agreement is necessary before such ratings are treated as reliable. Student self-assessment adds a separate measure of perceived difficulty, motivation, and creative agency.

This dataset provides direct, repeatable evidence. Measures may include pitch matching, interval discrimination, melodic memory, harmonic targeting, phrase coherence, rhythmic stability, subdivision, syncopation, technical control, and interactive improvisation. Tasks should be recorded at baseline and

repeated using parallel but non-identical materials. Scoring rubrics should distinguish accuracy, fluency, complexity, coherence, and expressive choice. Whenever possible, independent raters unaware of the student's symbolic profile should evaluate performances.

3.6 Observed creative behavior

Observation should include opportunities the student has not previously encountered. A lack of existing artwork does not indicate a lack of visual ability, and extensive phone use does not establish technological aptitude or deficiency. The teacher can offer several brief activities, document voluntary engagement, and allow the student to choose what to pursue. For minors, parental consent, age-appropriate safeguards, and the student's assent are essential; private social feeds should not be harvested or analyzed without explicit permission.

Student compositions, performances, writing, drawings, photography, video projects, and classroom behavior reveal demonstrated interests and forms of engagement. Voluntarily provided social-media photo streams may show recurring aesthetic subjects, color choices, framing, or visual rhythm; they do not by themselves establish personality, intelligence, or psychological traits. The educator can ask whether an interest in photography might make geometric phrase framing engaging, or whether narrative writing might support motivic development. The learner must be free to decline data collection, especially where minors are involved.

Figure 1. Six inputs feed provisional instructional hypotheses; the validity of those hypotheses is tested against observable outcomes. Blue indicates exploratory inputs; green indicates direct assessment or observation.

3.7 Triangulation without circular validation

A defensible research design assigns different evidentiary status to different inputs. Symbolic systems may suggest candidate interventions, psychometric instruments may supply limited preference information subject to their known limitations, and musical recordings provide direct observations of task performance. The integration process should preserve the provenance of each claim. A teacher should be able to state, for example, that an observation came from a recorded improvisation, a self-report, or an exploratory classification, rather than blending them into a single apparently objective score.

This also creates a route to falsification. If a proposed match between classification and instructional method does not predict improved outcomes, that relationship should be weakened or discarded. If a simpler model based only on prior musical experience and baseline performance predicts outcomes equally well, the additional datasets have not demonstrated incremental value. Such comparisons are essential to making H360 a research program rather than a closed interpretive system.

Agreement among astrology, Human Design, MBTI, and Enneagram is not independent confirmation: these systems can share broad descriptors, and an evaluator can selectively notice agreement. H360 therefore separates profile generation from outcome scoring. A preregistered study should compare an evidence-only curriculum with a curriculum additionally informed by exploratory categories, while measuring whether the additional information improves outcomes. A null finding would be scientifically informative and would support simplifying the model.

4. The adaptive curriculum cycle

At the first meeting, the instructor collects a short musical sample and asks the student to identify what they most want to be able to do. This goal may be phrased in ordinary language: play through changes without freezing, make longer phrases, respond to other musicians, compose an original piece, or understand harmony by ear. The teacher translates that goal into observable behaviors and selects a small number of exercises. Too many simultaneous objectives make it difficult to identify why a lesson succeeds or fails.

The next stage is a structured teaching experiment. For instance, a student who loses the form during improvisation might receive a visual form map, a bass-line listening task, and a call-and-response exercise in separate trials. The teacher records which method improves location within the form and which the student willingly repeats. The selected approach becomes the next week's primary practice task. Reassessment should include both the practiced material and a new musical example to test transfer. Improvement on the exact exercise alone may reflect memorization rather than general learning.

The loop also protects student autonomy. A profile should never become a permanent statement of what a learner is capable of. It is a working account of what has been observed, which teaching experiments have been attempted, and what remains uncertain. This makes revision an expected feature rather than an admission of failure.

The proposed instructional cycle is assessment, diagnosis, hypothesis, curriculum design, teaching, observation, and reassessment (Figure 2). Each proposed intervention should specify a target skill, a teaching method, a time window, and an outcome measure. For example: “After four sessions of short response phrases over a two-chord vamp, the student will increase the proportion of phrases that land intentionally on a specified chord tone.” Such statements can be tested; generalized claims that a learner “needs response energy” cannot.

Assessment distinguishes existing knowledge from accessible performance. A student who correctly sings guide tones but fails to reach them on the instrument may need technical mapping. A student who plays correct targets but cannot sustain a phrase may need motivic and rhythmic development. A student whose playing deteriorates only in front of an audience may require a different environment for skill transfer. The diagnostic profile is therefore an evolving record of observed constraints and effective interventions.

Figure 2. Teacher-supervised adaptive curriculum cycle. Reassessment revises the next instructional plan rather than permanently classifying the learner.

4.1 Contrasting lesson and video designs

For a response-centered lesson video, the teacher may present a two-measure melodic question, leave a clear response window, then offer a second question with one altered harmonic condition. The student records several responses and selects one for discussion. The educational target is rapid recognition and transformation, not speed for its own sake. Difficulty can increase through altered register, delayed entry, chromatic approach tones, or changes in phrase length.

An observation-centered video can use the same progression but first ask the student to identify cadence points, strong beats, and melodic motives. The student then chooses only two moments at which to enter, aiming for deliberate placement rather than continuous playing. A later trial combines observation and response. The comparison allows the teacher to determine whether one sequence yields better results for a particular learner, without treating either method as exclusive to a personality category.

A response-centered video can play a two-bar phrase, leave a two-bar opening, and ask the student to echo, oppose, extend, invert, or displace the material. Difficulty can increase by changing harmony, tempo, phrase length, or rhythmic ambiguity. An observation-centered video can present a longer passage, ask the student to identify the harmonic pivot or strongest melodic destination, and then invite a short intervention. These formats are educational alternatives, not fixed prescriptions for Human Design Types. Within-subject comparison can determine which produces better retention and transfer for a particular learner.

4.2 An illustrative four-week case

A hypothetical student enters with reliable instrumental technique and strong rhythmic imitation but limited ability to construct phrases over changing harmony. In week one, baseline recordings establish that the

student can hear target tones in isolation but rarely approaches them intentionally in improvisation. The teacher introduces a sustained drone and two target pitches, asking the student to sing, locate, and approach each tone with short melodic cells.

In week two, the same targets appear within a simple progression. The student alternates between prepared phrases and uninterrupted improvisation, following the distinction between technical rehearsal and creative performance. In week three, the student develops one short motive through rhythmic displacement and register changes, using both auditory examples and a visual diagram. In week four, the student records a new improvisation over an unfamiliar progression and reflects on confidence, phrase continuity, and target accuracy.

Success would not be inferred from the student's enjoyment alone. It would require improvement in predefined musical outcomes, ideally assessed by listeners who do not know which teaching approach was used. The case is illustrative, not a claim that an actual participant has completed this protocol.

Consider a hypothetical student with strong melodic imitation and pitch recognition, but weak phrase continuity during improvisation. The teacher first confirms these observations with recorded baseline tasks. Week 1 uses two-bar echo-and-extension exercises; Week 2 adds harmonic targeting at phrase endings; Week 3 introduces rhythmic displacement while preserving a recognizable motif; Week 4 asks the student to improvise over unfamiliar progressions and to explain what they heard. Each week includes a brief self-report of engagement and an independently rated performance sample. The example illustrates a decision pathway, not an observed study result.

Figure 3. Illustrative, hypothetical student case: observed strengths and obstacles determine a four-week intervention and a measurable retest.

5. Why 360 degrees?

The 360-degree circle is useful because several musical organizations can be represented without changing the underlying coordinate space. Equal-tempered pitch classes form twelve sectors of thirty degrees each; threefold structures occupy positions separated by 120 degrees; fourfold structures use ninety-degree separations; and fivefold structures use seventy-two-degree separations. The choice does not make these divisions acoustically equivalent. It makes their geometric relationships easy to calculate, visualize, and compare.

A continuous coordinate also avoids forcing every event onto the twelve-tone grid. If the octave is defined as 360 degrees, a displacement of 1.5 degrees corresponds to five cents. For a base frequency of 220 Hz, a point at 180 degrees represents 220 × 2^(1/2), approximately 311.13 Hz. Such mappings are mathematically clear, but they remain a design convention: alternative mappings could be tested for perceptual usefulness. Exact just-intonation ratios may also be stored alongside their angular equivalents so that ratio information is not lost during conversion.

An important distinction concerns superposition. When several operators are represented as pitches, the auditory result depends not only on angular spacing but also on octave placement, amplitude, duration, timbre, and temporal order. A chord that appears symmetrical on a circle may sound quite different after revoicing. H360 therefore treats listening as an indispensable evaluative step. The circle proposes relationships; musical perception and instructional outcomes determine their usefulness.

The mathematical basis of H360 is a circle of 360 degrees, a convenient coordinate system because $360 = 2^3 \times 3^2 \times 5$ and admits numerous exact integer subdivisions. It supports equal divisions by 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 12, among others. The circle is a coordinate convention, not an assertion that pitch, color, rhythm, and psychology are physically identical. Its advantage is a consistent address system for constructing and comparing explicitly defined transformations.

If one octave is mapped to a full revolution, the equal-tempered semitone spans 30 degrees and one degree spans 1200/360 = 3.333… cents. With reference frequency f_0 and angular position θ, the frequency is $f(\theta) = f_0 \times 2^{(\theta/360)}$. Exact interval ratios can be expressed as continuous positions: $\theta = 360 \log_2(r)$, where r is the frequency ratio. Thus a 3:2 perfect fifth is not forced onto an integer-degree grid. Higher-prime ratios and irregular subdivisions may use fractional coordinates without losing precision.

Figure 4. One-octave mapping onto 360 degrees. Twelve equal-tempered semitones occupy 30 degrees each; threefold symmetry is superimposed as a separate proportional structure.

Educationally, a learner may see the same harmonic relation as a spatial angle, hear it as an interval, sing it against a drone, or manipulate it through a visual interface. Whether multimodal presentation improves learning must be tested rather than presumed. A useful comparison is an auditory-only exercise versus an otherwise equivalent auditory-plus-geometry exercise, scored on later auditory transfer without the diagram.

6. MIDI360 as a proposed interoperability layer

A useful event record would preserve a source coordinate, its mapping rule, the resulting frequency or pitch ratio, an optional conventional MIDI note number, a pitch deviation, onset, duration, register, and a link to the generating operator. It could also retain transformations such as inversion, rotation, rhythmic displacement, and octave redistribution. Storing both the source and the rendered event allows an educator to explain why a generated note appeared, rather than presenting an opaque audio output.

For education, the most valuable feature may be reversible visualization. A student could hear a phrase, view its interval relationships on a circle, change one coordinate, and immediately hear the result. The same data could generate notation, a keyboard representation, a rhythmic cycle, or a geometric animation. This would support multiple routes into a shared musical concept without requiring every learner to begin with conventional notation.

MIDI360 is the working name for a proposed structured communication architecture linking H360 coordinates to musical devices, notation, synthesis, visualization, and AI systems. It is not an adopted MIDI standard, and this paper does not claim a completed reference implementation. Its design principle is backward compatibility with existing music technology while preserving information needed for precise pitch, proportional timing, and higher-order relationships.

A prospective MIDI360 event might carry a circular coordinate, exact ratio or frequency, register, onset, duration, velocity or intensity, articulation, trajectory, and relational metadata. The representation would then be translated into appropriate conventional MIDI or MIDI-compatible control streams where possible, or into microtonal synthesis and software-native representations when greater precision is required. Technical specification must address tuning reference, serialization, time base, polyphony, expressive control, and loss during conversion.

Figure 5. Conceptual MIDI360 interoperability: structured coordinates and ratios can be translated to sound, visual display, and AI conditioning. All functions shown are proposed, not claims of implemented software.

7. Functional operators and personalized generative AI

The operator layer is designed to specify musical behavior in language that can be interpreted across different media and styles. An operator might request a stable low-register center while upper voices relocate, or a phrase that repeats twice before changing its accent and entry point. Another might require a delayed answer, an inversion of a previous contour, or the temporary destabilization of a tonal center followed by recentering. These instructions concern relationships among events rather than a fixed sound palette.

The separation between operator, lyrics, and style is fundamental. The operator describes the musical process; the lyric supplies verbal meaning and prosody; the style specification identifies instrumentation, production conventions, or genre. A student could therefore explore the same structural idea in a jazz trio, an electronic setting, or an unaccompanied vocal exercise. The comparison asks whether the musical relationship survives a change of surface treatment. This is a proposed workflow for generative systems, not a statement that every commercial model offers independent controls for these fields.

The teacher should retain the ability to edit and reject outputs. Generative models may ignore structural instructions, produce technically inaccurate examples, or substitute familiar genre clichés for the requested transformation. H360 therefore requires an audit of generated materials: identify the intended operation, listen for its presence, compare the output with the original specification, and revise or regenerate when necessary. The resulting material is a teaching resource, not an authority on the student's identity.

H360 proposes a functional operator layer upstream of a generative music model. Instead of beginning only with “jazz ballad” or “electronic music,” the educator specifies musical behavior: stable low reference with moving upper voices, displacement of a motif, tension followed by recentering, delayed call-and-response, or controlled rhythmic asymmetry. Operators are descriptions of musical relationships and transformations. Their role in this paper is practical: they translate a learning objective into reusable structural instructions.

The operator input must remain logically distinct from two other inputs. Lyrics specify language, narrative, and imagery; style/instrumentation specifies genre, arrangement, timbre, and production. The same operator specification may therefore be tested with different lyrics or different musical styles. Conversely, the same lyrics can be realized with different structural operators. Some commercial systems provide only one text prompt; H360 would still prepare the inputs separately before combining them for that interface.

Figure 6. Three logically separate AI-generation inputs: structural operators, lyrics, and stylistic realization. The separation enables controlled comparisons and cross-style translation.

7.1 Cross-style operator translation

Cross-style translation creates a practical experimental test. First, define a short operator sequence independently of genre: establish a tonal center, repeat a cell, displace its onset, move the upper line while the bass holds, and resolve at a new center. Next, generate or compose versions using different instrumental and stylistic settings. Expert listeners can judge whether the sequence remains recognizable. Students can then perform the transformations themselves, demonstrating whether they understand the underlying process rather than merely imitating an audio example.

This procedure also allows a distinction between structural identity and stylistic conditioning. A musician may be fluent in the gestures of a favorite player but less comfortable relocating the same ideas to unfamiliar contexts. Preserving the operator while changing the surface may encourage flexible musical thinking. Whether it actually improves transfer is an empirical question suitable for controlled instruction.

The proposed cross-style capability asks whether a relational structure can remain recognizable when translated into different musical surfaces. For example, a repeating phrase that shifts its tonal center while preserving a low reference might be rendered as solo piano, chamber ensemble, electronic production, or jazz quartet. The research challenge is to define structural fidelity and evaluate it using expert ratings and computational descriptors. Genre similarity alone is not evidence of operator preservation.

7.2 AI-generated educational materials

An adaptive system could produce ear-training examples, short harmonic studies, call-and-response recordings, accompaniment tracks, notated exercises, visualizations, and instructional videos. Difficulty parameters might include tempo, register, number of chord changes, rhythmic density, tonal stability, and

response latency. The teacher would select outputs based on a documented objective and review them for accuracy, appropriateness, and artistic value before use. AI is a content-generation assistant, not an autonomous authority on the student.

8. Research design and evaluation

A feasible pilot study could recruit students with varied levels of jazz improvisation experience and randomly assign them to a conventional curriculum or an adaptive curriculum matched for lesson time, teacher attention, and practice expectations. Both groups would complete baseline and post-intervention recordings. A later follow-up would test retention. If full randomization is not possible, a within-student crossover design could compare two instructional sequences, with counterbalancing to reduce order effects.

The primary outcome should be specified before instruction begins. For example, researchers might choose harmonic-target accuracy on an unfamiliar progression or a blinded composite rating of improvisational coherence. Secondary outcomes could include rhythmic stability, phrase continuity, transfer to new keys, practice adherence, perceived agency, and enjoyment. Multiple comparisons should be controlled or explicitly labeled exploratory. Recordings should be evaluated without revealing group assignment whenever practical.

The contribution of each dataset should also be examined through ablation studies. A baseline model using musical assessment alone can be compared with models that add observed creative behavior, personality self-report, and symbolic datasets. If the richer model fails to improve predictions on held-out students, its additional complexity is not justified. Sample size, missing data, evaluator reliability, and instructor effects should be reported transparently. Qualitative interviews may explain why particular interventions felt helpful, but should not replace outcome measures.

A separate technical evaluation could test whether MIDI360 records preserve intended frequency relationships through conversion, whether operator specifications can be reproduced consistently, and whether students can correctly identify structural transformations across styles. These engineering and perception tests should be reported separately from any claim about educational effectiveness. Such separation would permit progress on the musical technology even if some diagnostic hypotheses prove unsupported.

A separate AI experiment can hold operator instructions constant while varying style and lyrics, then ask blinded listeners whether the intended structural behavior persists. Another experiment can compare student learning with teacher-selected conventional examples versus teacher-selected AI-generated examples matched for difficulty. Neither experiment should assume that an attractive generated piece is an effective teaching tool; the relevant outcome is learning.

9. Ethics, limitations, and scope

The framework should never be used to determine a student's ceiling, deny access to an activity, or make high-stakes admissions decisions. Student participation in symbolic profiling should be optional. Personal information must be minimized, access-controlled, and separated from research records when possible. Instructors should avoid interpreting medical, psychological, or family conditions from creative artifacts or social media. For younger students, safeguarding and the right to decline particular activities take precedence over diagnostic curiosity.

Finally, the approach requires attention to instructor workload. A sophisticated diagnostic process that consumes most of a lesson without improving learning would not be practical. Research should therefore track time spent assessing, preparing, and reviewing materials, and compare that cost with observed gains. The intended endpoint is a usable teaching system that supports professional judgment rather than replacing it.

Astrology and Human Design are not scientifically validated measures of learning ability. MBTI and Enneagram interpretations have important psychometric limitations. Their inclusion in H360 is an explicit exploratory research choice and does not justify high-stakes educational decisions. A student’s self-description

or social media imagery must not be used to infer sensitive characteristics or restrict opportunities. For minors, guardian consent, age-appropriate assent, minimal collection, and secure handling are essential. Teachers should avoid deterministic labels and explain the uncertainty of all interpretive claims.

The present paper is a conceptual and methodological proposal, not a report of completed controlled trials. The MIDI360 architecture and operator-conditioned AI workflow require engineering and empirical validation. The six-dataset framework may prove too complex or may add little predictive value beyond musical assessment and student preference interviews. That possibility is part of the research question. A scientifically responsible implementation must be willing to simplify or discard components that do not improve outcomes.

10. Conclusion

Harmonic 360 proposes a teacher-supervised cycle connecting multidimensional assessment, testable instructional hypotheses, structured musical representations, and adaptive creative materials. Its educational contribution would be established not by the elegance of its symbolic architecture, but by whether students learn more effectively, retain musical understanding, transfer skills to new settings, and gain creative independence. The 360-degree coordinate system offers a precise common language for proportional musical relations; MIDI360 and functional operators propose a route from those relations to educational technology and AI generation. Kenny Werner's emphasis on creative freedom adds an important reminder: technical knowledge and the ability to access that knowledge in performance are not the same educational problem. H360's ultimate aim is to provide students with more ways to hear, understand, practice, and create—not to confine them to a diagnosis.

References

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 5(1), 7–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102

Helmholtz, H. L. F. von. (1954). On the sensations of tone as a physiological basis for the theory of music (A. J. Ellis, Trans.). Dover. (Original work published 1863).

Kepler, J. (1619). Harmonices mundi.

Kenny, B. J., & Gellrich, M. (2002). Improvisation. In R. Parncutt & G. E. McPherson (Eds.), The science and psychology of music performance (pp. 117–134). Oxford University Press.

McPherson, G. E., & Renwick, J. M. (2001). A longitudinal study of self-regulation in children's musical practice. Music Education Research, 3(2), 169–186.

Sethares, W. A. (2005). Tuning, timbre, spectrum, scale (2nd ed.). Springer.

Werner, K. (1996). Effortless mastery: Liberating the master musician within. Jamey Aebersold Jazz.

Valdez, D. C. (2026). Harmonic 360: Hearing the geometry [Unpublished working manuscript].

Valdez, D. C. (2026). Harmonic 360 operating document: Factors, voices, vectors [Unpublished working document].